United Nations A/HRC/WG.6/28/PER/3

General Assembly

Distr.: General
9 August 2017
English
Original: English/Spanish

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Twenty-eighth session
6-17 November 2017

Summary of stakeholders' submissions on Peru*

Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

I. Background

1. The present report was prepared pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21, taking into consideration the periodicity of the universal periodic review. It is a summary of 41 stakeholders' submissions[1] to the universal periodic review, presented in a summarized manner owing to word-limit constraints. A separate section is provided for the contribution by the national human rights institution that is accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles.

II. Information provided by the national human rights institution accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles

2. The Peruvian Ombudsman's Office (DdPP) noted the need for data on homophobic and transphobic violence and the enactment of legislation on gender identity.[2]

3. The Office said that concerns had been raised about police activities, despite the progress made following the enactment of Legislative Decree No. 1186 regulating the use of force by the National Police.[3]

4. The Office stated that harassment was the main problem faced in the prison system, in addition to the lack of inspections, food and medical services.[4]

5. The Office claimed that the law establishing the Ombudsman's Office as the national mechanism for the prevention of torture did not provide for additional funding.[5]

6. The Office warned that the special judicial subsystem for serious human rights violations would need to be strengthened and decentralized and its exclusivity would need to be maintained.[6]

7. The Office noted that there was a climate of social tolerance towards human trafficking and that the situation called for inter-institutional work in that regard.[7]

* The present document was not edited before being sent to United Nations translation services.

8. With regard to recommendation 116.1,[9] the Office said that there were differences between the special regime and the private employment regime.[10]

9. The Office underlined the need for guidelines on HIV prevention among indigenous peoples.[11]

10. With regard to recommendations 116.28 and 116.29[12] on the political participation of women, the Office recommended supplementing the gender quota with measures such as alternating male and female candidates on electoral lists.[13]

11. The Office drew attention to the high mortality rate, for reasons linked to the quality of health-care services during pregnancy.[14]

12. The Office noted with concern the poor quality of health-care services for victims of rape and the failure to collect legal evidence.[15]

13. With regard to violence against women in intimate relationships,[16] the Office recommended training the personnel of the National Police and improving inter-institutional coordination.

14. The Office said that it had been designated as the country's independent mechanism under the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. It therefore monitored pending issues such as the harmonization of legislation, legal capacity and education.[17]

15. The Office recommended that consultations on mining, oil and gas projects should be carried out during the environmental impact assessment process.[18]

16. The Office said that the Legislative Decree on Migration had entered into force in 2017, but the corresponding regulations were still not ready.[19]

III. Information provided by other stakeholders

A. Scope of international obligations[20] and cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and bodies[21]

17. The National Human Rights Coordinator (CNDDHH) noted the lack of political will to abolish the death penalty, illustrated by the failure to ratify the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. It added that Peru had also not ratified the International Labour Organization Domestic Workers Convention, 2011 (No. 189).[22]

18. Amnesty International (AI) and Peru Support Group (PSG) recognized positive developments in terms of treaty ratification or recognition of competence of treaty bodies, but noted that Peru had not ratified the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, despite committing during the last review, and had not recognized the competence of the Committee on Enforced Disappearances to receive individual communications among States.[23]

19. The Comisión Jurídica para el Autodesarrollo de los Pueblos Originarios Andinos (CAPAJ) observed the indifference of the State party towards the Human Rights Committee's Views on communication No. 1457/2006 on indigenous peoples.[24]

B. National human rights framework[25]

20. The Runa Institute, the Centro de Investigación Interdisciplinar en Sexualidad, Sida y Sociedad (CIISSS), the National Human Rights Coordinator and Joint Submission (JS) JS9 said that all mention of protection on the grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity had been removed from the National Human Rights Plan 2014-2016, despite the fact that lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex (LGBTI) groups had participated in its preparation and that a new National Human Rights Plan 2017-2020 was under consultation.[26]

21. AI, PSG and Society for Threatened Peoples (STP) raised concerns about the political independence of the new Ombudsman, the change of its staff, and its weakened actions to guarantee respect for human rights in the country and its budget.[26]

C. Implementation of international human rights obligations, taking into account applicable international humanitarian law

1. Cross-cutting issues

Equality and non-discrimination[27]

22. CIISSS and AI drew attention to discrimination against the LGBTI population, including hate crimes on the grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity, which created barriers to access to rights such as health care, education, employment and housing.[28] CIISSS said that the State did not have effective mechanisms in place to deal with the problem and protect the LGBTI population.[29] The Runa Institute noted with concern the issue of non-recognition of the identity of transgender persons.[30]

23. CIISSS, JS9 and JS12 referred to Legislative Decree No. 1323, which amended the Criminal Code by adding sexual orientation and gender identity as prohibited grounds for discrimination. They warned that the legislation was being challenged in the Congress.[31] The Runa Institute reported that same-sex sexual relations continued to be punishable under the disciplinary code of the National Police.[32]

24. The Runa Institute and JS9 stated that, owing to the opposition of various conservative groups, a number of bills aimed at eradicating discrimination against the LGBTI community had been unsuccessful.[33]

25. JS9 reported on the establishment of the National Anti-Discrimination Commission, on the creation in the Ministry of Women of the Working Group to Promote the Rights of Lesbians and on the publication of handbooks for the National Police and the media prohibiting discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity.[34]

26. JS12 said that the "Warning against Racism" platform, a mechanism to provide guidance to the public on how to deal with acts of discrimination, was not well publicized and did not provide for penalty mechanisms.[35] JS16 said that the State did not effectively penalize the broadcasting of television programmes and commercials featuring content that was racist and discriminatory towards the Afro-Peruvian population.[36]

Development, the environment, and business and human rights[37]

27. JS2 drew attention to the impact of the exploitation of oil and gas in the territories of indigenous peoples and of oil spills.[38] Cultural Survival (CS) noted that the extractive industry had a devastating impact on the environment in indigenous territories, and that the Environmental State of Emergency and the Health Care of Emergencies declared by the Government had lacked adequate funds.[39] STP noted that Peru had suffered more than 150 oil leaks during the last years.[40] PSG was concerned about the lack of prevention and remedial mechanisms to deal with a number of oil spills.[41]

28. The Human Rights Commission (COMISEDH) said that public policies on environmental pollution were inconsistent. The Office of the Deputy Minister for Culture did not have an adequate monitoring mechanism, given that the Environmental Evaluation and Accounting Office did not have the autonomy or the authority to impose environmental fines or monitor violations.[42]

29. JS18 and COMISEDH noted the weakening of environmental oversight through Act No. 30230 and observed that the Executive had enacted various legislative decrees that violated rights and weakened environmental management.[43]

30. Proetica noted that, between January and March 2017, Peru had been affected by a serious and extensive climate crisis, with flooding and overflowing rivers, that had resulted in several deaths, injuries and destruction, and drew attention to the inefficient implementation of the budget for disaster prevention.[44]

31. Perú Equidad said that the State should prevent, investigate, punish and provide compensation for violations of economic, social, cultural and environmental rights that occurred as a result of the activities of Chinese mining companies.[45]

2. Civil and Political Rights

Right to life, liberty and security of person[46]

32. CNDDHH reported that the Constitutional Court had revised Legislative Decrees Nos. 1094 and 1095. It said that it was concerned by the deployment of the Armed Forces being authorized for tasks related to internal order when there had not been a prior declaration of a state of emergency.[47]

33. JS14 and the International Human Right Clinic of the University of Oklahoma (IHRC-OU) referred that the law No. 30151, in force since January 2014, modified the Criminal Code in order to grant immunity from prosecution to "armed forces and police personnel who in fulfilment of their duty and using their weapons or other means of defence, cause injury or death", regardless of compliance with national regulations or international standards. [48]PSG and JS14 noted that it made it impossible to hold police officers accountable.[49]

34. JS17 acknowledged that the enactment of Legislative Decree No. 1186, which for the first time established a legal framework for the use of force by the police, incorporated internationally recognized standards. JS17 added that the Decree did not guarantee the provision of appropriate equipment and training to ensure that police operations were in line with the standards set out therein.[50] JS14 recognized that the new law had incorporated international principles, but still allowed the use of lethal weapons in the event of a "violent, tumultuous assembly", without clearly defining these conditions.[51]

35. COMISEDH noted the lack of operating handbooks for proper police conduct and the legitimate use of force in the event of social protests.[52] STP and AI expressed concern about the State's repressive answers to legitimate social manifestation.[53] JS14 referred to the common practice of the Peruvian Government to arbitrarily declare a state of emergency.[54] CNDDHH noted that, in addition to the difficulty of investigating police involved in acts of arbitrary use of force, there was a lack of diligence in the investigations of the Public Prosecution Service.[55]

36. JS20 drew attention to violence against women sex workers by the police authorities and local government security forces.[56] With regard to recommendation 116.16,[57] JS11 reported that transgender women involved in sex work were the primary victims of State officials.[58] JS9 noted the violence against lesbians and transgender women.[59]

37. CNDDHH said that the legislation on the national mechanism for the prevention of torture had not been implemented and that the Ombudsman's Office had not been reformed to carry out its functions properly.[60] COMISEDH added that the main challenge to implementation was a lack of will on the part of the new Ombudsman.[61]

Administration of justice, including impunity and the rule of law[62]

38. CIISS reported on discrimination in access to justice faced by the LGBTI community and Centro de Desarrollo Étnico (CEDET) drew attention to the discrimination faced by Afro-descendent women.[63] JS9 noted the evidentiary standards that hindered access to justice for transgender persons.[64] JS12 drew attention to the barriers faced by rural and indigenous women in obtaining access to the State justice system,[65] while JS20 said that there was a lack of trust in the administration of justice among women sex workers.[66]

39. Proetica reported that corruption and poor resource management in the justice system undermined legal protections.[67] JS12 drew attention to the limited number of interpreters of indigenous languages in the justice system.[68] JS11 said that there were no specialized protocols for dealing with LGBTI victims.[69]

40. With reference to juvenile justice and recommendations 116.10, 116.30 and 116.41,[70] JS6 stated that the necessary budgets had not been made available to implement the objectives of the National Plan for the Prevention and Treatment of Adolescents in

Conflict with the Law or the Code of Adolescent Criminal Responsibility following their adoption, nor had the necessary changes been made.[71]

41. With regard to recommendations 116.72, 116.108 and 116.23,[72] JS19 said that indigenous peoples had not been consulted on the bills on coordination between the ordinary and special or indigenous justice systems and that the bills' constitutionality was problematic, in that they prevented serious cases from being brought before the indigenous courts. That situation already occurred.[73]

42. COMISEDH noted that the recent Act on the Search for Persons who Disappeared during the Period of Violence from 1980 to 2000 marked the first step by the State to establish the truth. It was concerned, however, about major shortcomings in the National Plan on the Search for Persons who Disappeared between 1980 and 2000, which in practice stripped the document of its meaning.[74]

43. AI noted that impunity for human rights violations committed during the internal armed conflict continued to be a cause of great concern, despite the fact that several emblematic rulings were adopted.[75] CNDDHH added that, between 2011 and 2016, the Ministries of Defence and the Interior had consistently failed to provide information to the Public Prosecution Service and the judiciary.[76]

44. CNDDHH reported that the programmes of reparations for victims of human rights violations between 1980 and 2000 had not been effectively implemented; for example, victims of sexual violence had not been included in the Comprehensive Reparations Programme.[77]

Fundamental freedoms and the right to participate in public and political life[78]

45. CNDDHH said that, between 2011 and 2016, 78 human rights defenders had been killed and that there had not been any public policy to protect them. It added that several defenders had been harassed during arbitrary criminal proceedings and their work had not been recognized.[79] Similar concerns were expressed by JS14, AI and Front Line Defenders (FLD).[80]

46. JS14 noted that none of the recommendations[81] on the protection of HRDs was implemented, and added that human rights defenders faced harassment, intimidation, surveillance, criminalization and physical violence.[82] JS14 also referred to the obstacles faced by civil society organizations to receive foreign funds.[83]

47. JS11 observed that the stereotypes surrounding those who defended sexual and reproductive rights legitimized the improper use of the judicial system or the supervisory powers of the legislative authorities against them.[84]

48. JS17 and JS14 noted that environmental activists and indigenous leaders faced major risks in their advocacy work.[85] Meanwhile, FDI. and JS14 raised concerns about the situation of trade unions leaders in Peru.[86]

49. AI stated that lawyers defending victims of human rights violations had also faced persecution and legal harassment. AI was also concerned about the situation of women defenders, who had faced gender-based violence and smear campaigns.[87]

50. Reporters Without Borders (RSF-RWB) noted that reports of threats, physical attacks and even murders of media personnel were not uncommon in Peru. It noted that the orchestrators of the attacks came from either organized crime groups or locally elected officials. RSF-RWB stated that the main threats came from the country's criminal defamation laws, which had in the past seen journalists jailed for writing stories in good faith.[88] Similar concerns were raised by JS14 and JS17.[89]

51. RSF-RWB reported that the ownership of Peruvian media was unusually concentrated, to such a degree that it threatened freedom of speech.[90]

52. CNDDHH said that women had still not exceeded the 30 per cent threshold for elected office and held less than 5 per cent of elected posts in local and regional governments. Referring to recommendations 116.29 and 116.36,[91] JS10 reported extensively on the way that the political harassment of women acted as a barrier to their

political participation.[92] JS10 highlighted the need to adopt legislation addressing the political harassment of women by means of prevention, treatment and punishment.[93]

53. JS14 noted that six recommendations on the right to freedom of assembly were not implemented, while one was only partially implemented.[94]

Prohibition of all forms of slavery[95]

54. With reference to recommendation 116.21 [96] on trafficking in persons, JS6 recognized that progress had been made on public policy but noted that budget cuts hampered their implementation.[97] Regarding recommendation 116.42,[98] JS11 reported that progress had been made with regard to prevention and prosecution, but problems remained in relation to the care and protection of victims.[99] Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd (CLCGS) noted that women reported abuses suffered during the rescue by police officers.[100]

55. JS12 drew attention to the labour and sexual exploitation to which indigenous women were subjected as a result of the incursion of extractive industries.[101]

56. CLCGS noted that in 2017 was promulgated Legislative Decree N°1323, creating the offence of sexual exploitation.[102]

Right to privacy and family life[103]

57. JS19 said that, although there had been an increase in identification campaigns in rural areas, there were still many undocumented indigenous persons in the Amazon region, a situation that prevented them from exercising their political rights and enjoying access to education, health and social programmes. It recognized that the Government had launched a bilingual birth certificate register in some indigenous languages but noted that bilingual identity cards had not yet been introduced.[104]

58. CIISSS drew attention to the need for international support for the Gender Identity Act, given that conservative groups in the Congress held views that were opposed to the adoption of the initiative.[105]

3. Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work[106]

59. JS12 made a comment on indigenous women who had moved to urban centres and were employed primarily as domestic workers under conditions regulated by Act No. 27986, although these were discriminatory compared to other rules governing private activity.[107] CEDET noted that it was difficult to draw any conclusions on the workplaces of Afro-Peruvian women, given the lack of data on the subject.[108]

60. The Runa Institute said that the imposition of barriers preventing access to the right to work was the most striking example of discrimination against the transgender population.[109]

61. JS20 drew attention to the need to enact legislation regulating sex work, with the objective of reducing the stigma and discrimination faced by sex workers and guaranteeing a minimum level of rights.[110]

Right to an adequate standard of living[111]

62. Referring to recommendations 116.81-82, 116.84, 116.87, 116.89 and 116.110,[112] JS19 said that the State had not combated poverty among indigenous peoples. JS19 added that their poverty had been exacerbated by State policies of expropriating indigenous territories for the benefit of agro-industrial corporations along the coast and in the jungle, mining companies in the mountains and oil companies in the jungle.[113] CLCGS referred to the chronic malnutrition of children.[114]

Right to health[115]

63. COMISEDH drew attention to the effects of environmental pollution on the health of indigenous peoples and observed that the abolition of the Directorate of Indigenous Peoples attached to the Office of the Deputy Minister for Public Health by the Ministry of Health had marked a major step backwards.[116] JS19 expressed similar concerns.[117]

64. Concerning recommendations 116.72, 116.108 and 116.23,[118] JS19 said that the sectoral policy on intercultural health drawn up with the participation of indigenous organizations had not been implemented for lack of funds and that 51.2 per cent of communities did not have any type of health-care facilities.[119]

65. JS9 noted that the national guidelines for comprehensive sexual and reproductive health care and the National Sexual and Reproductive Health Strategy focused on heterosexual women.[120] The Runa Institute pointed out that health-care protocols did not take account of transgender persons.[121]

66. JS12 said that the country's maternal mortality rate had gone down overall but not in regions with large indigenous populations.[122] JS7 drew attention to the high maternal mortality rate among adolescents, public misinformation, discrimination and problems with infrastructure and equipment.[123] Referring to recommendations 116.95 and 116.98,[124] JS6 and JS7 noted that the teenage pregnancy rate had not decreased and there were still barriers preventing access to information.[125]

67. AI stated that abortion remained criminalized, except in cases where the health or life of the pregnant woman and girl was at risk. It added that despite the adoption of the guidelines on therapeutic abortion in 2014, clandestine and unsafe abortions were predominant.[126] JS11 recalled that a discussion on the decriminalization of abortion in cases of rape was pending in the Congress.[127] Alliance Defending Freedom International (ADF) reported on the issue of the right to life in the context of abortion, and noted that Peru must invest in social and economic development and by providing support to women throughout and after pregnancy.[128]

68. CEDET commented on racial stereotypes of Afro-Peruvian women that seriously affected their access to health care.[129] It added that the lack of updated statistical data made it difficult to estimate how many Afro-Peruvian children did not have adequate access to health care.[130] JS16 referred to the lack of public health policies for the Afro-Peruvian population.[131]

Right to education[132]

69. With regard to recommendations 116.23, 116.25, 116.31 and 116.99-116.104,[133] JS3 recognized that access to basic and higher education, enrolment and inclusion of students with disabilities had increased, but progress had been uneven.[134] JS3 drew attention to high rates of teenage pregnancy and the fact that 84.4 per cent of pregnant teenagers dropped out of school. JS6 added that unwanted teenage pregnancies prevented girls from completing their regular basic education and going on to higher education.[135]

70. JS3 reported on the increased privatization of education and a corresponding downgrading of the public education sector, its teachers and workers.[136] JS3 added that, despite the introduction of a series of instruments and positive incentives, there continued to be problems in the teaching profession.[137]

71. With respect to recommendations 116.31 and 116.99-116.104,[138] JS7 stressed that there was a lack of effective measures to combat school dropout, improve the quality of education in rural areas or address the unequal allocation of resources in schools and that the Ministry of Education showed little concern about the school dropout rate or the refusal of teachers to teach in rural areas, among other problems.[139]

72. JS9 recognized that the new regular basic education curriculum included as cross-cutting themes gender equality and non-discrimination based on difference, including sexual orientation and gender identity.[140] JS9, JS11, JS6 and CIISSS warned that conservative sectors had initiated a campaign against the alleged "gender ideology" and had

launched a strategy with the slogan "Don't Mess with My Children", which aimed to have the curriculum terminated.[141]

73. JS1 drew attention to problems in the alternative education and community education systems.[142]

74. The Runa Institute said that the education provided was based on binary male-female gender models, which meant that educational content was detrimental to transgender students.[143] CEDET and JS16 noted with concern that the lack of references to the origins of the Afro-Peruvian population and other important historical events was harmful to students' development.[144]

75. CEDET said that only 33 per cent of Afro-Peruvians aged between 18 and 26 years had gone on to higher education.[145] JS19 said that the Government established schools in indigenous villages without adequate budgets.[146]

4. Rights of specific persons or groups

Women[147]

76. CLCGS welcomed adopted legislation regarding the criminalization of violence against women, including femicide, sexual harassment, and promoting equal opportunities between women and men and several national plans; however, despite these laws 70.8 per cent of women had suffered some type of violence by their partner.[148] Concerning recommendations 116.30 and 116.41,[149] JS6 reported that sexual violence was still a common occurrence and girls aged between 12 and 17 made up the largest victim group. The women's emergency centres had difficulties in implementing the new Comprehensive Care Guidelines, which would improve the performance of their interdisciplinary teams and enable lawyers to represent victims in cases of sexual violence.[150]

77. CNDDHH reported that the Register of Victims of Forced Sterilization that had been created to record victims of forced sterilization carried out between 1996 and 2000 had various shortcomings, there had not yet been any prosecutions and a public policy of reparations had not been initiated.[151] JS8 said that a discrepancy between the number of victims requesting inclusion in the register and the number identified in the course of investigations showed that the register was still incomplete.[152]

78. With reference to recommendation 116.56,[153] JS8 said that victims continued to experience adverse effects on their mental and physical health and on their relationships with their families and communities.[154] JS12 claimed that women who had been subjected to sexual violence during the armed conflict or to forced sterilization had not received justice or reparations.[155] Similar concerns were raised by AI, PSG and STP.[156]

Children[157]

79. CLCGS noted that Peru had made progress in developing frameworks, plans and programmes regarding children and adolescents.[158]

80. Regarding recommendations 116.9, 116.12 and 116.50,[159] JS6 reported the adoption of Act No. 30403, which prohibited the physical or humiliating punishment of children and adolescents in all spheres. However, corporal punishment continued to be a widespread practice in society and the Act had yet to be disseminated in all educational institutions.[160] JS13 reported on the inadequate governmental capacity to carry out an effective enforcement of the law.[161] JS13 noted that the Ministry of Women and Vulnerable Populations had launched a campaign called "Do not hit, do not humiliate", and civil society had launched the campaign called "Dare to bring up with love"; however, those efforts were insufficient.[162]

81. JS6 drew attention to problems in relation to the Code on Children and Adolescents, which had not yet been adopted, and noted that majority opinion in the Congress was not in line with the Convention on the Rights of the Child.[163]

82. JS7 said that children's participation was symbolic and limited.[164] JS1 noted that street children and adolescents were the visible manifestation of clear social injustice.[165]

JS13 referred to the need to strengthen the Municipal Defenders of Children and Adolescents, by setting up the necessary structures for facilitating a complaints procedure.[166]

Persons with disabilities[167]

83. CNDDHH reported that the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities had not been fully implemented, since the standing multisectoral committee tasked with following up the Convention had had to be reactivated and its structure expanded to allow for the participation of civil society.[168]

84. Human Rights Watch (HRW) stated that although Peru had put in force some legal and administrative provisions to facilitate political participation for people with disabilities, civil legislation maintained the restrictions of legal capacity.[169] JS4 confirmed that no practical progress had been made in relation to legal capacity.[170]

85. HRW noted that Peru had not yet reformed its electoral legislation to enable people with disabilities to fully exercise their political rights.[171]

86. JS4 reported that the Ministry of Labour and Job Creation had mainstreamed disability in its social programmes, but the real impact of that measure was not known.[172]

87. JS4 observed that there was a lack of health care for persons with disabilities, which translated into a lack of full accessibility, reasonable accommodation and availability of services, among other shortcomings. It added that the law maintained a distinction between special education and mainstream education, thus facilitating exclusion, and that the State had not regulated inclusiveness in private educational establishments.[173]

88. In relation to recommendations 116.105-116.107,[174] JS7 referred to problems of discrimination against children with disabilities, drawing attention to such issues as the lack of flexibility in public services, the shortage of educational institutions and the lack of specific teacher training.[175]

Minorities and indigenous peoples[176]

89. JS19 raised the question of why neither the law nor the regulations on prior consultation complied with international standards and added that the State had not consulted indigenous peoples on laws likely to affect them and did not have regulations to that effect.[177] JS2 set out the reasons why prior consultation did not work in the extractive sector, such as the lack of titles to land, new requirements, the failure to engage in prior consultation before 2011, information workshops, the use of "prior agreement" and the lack of consultation before concessions were granted.[178]

90. JS18 noted the measures on which there had been prior consultation in the mining, oil and gas sectors and the results of four processes of prior consultation at the national level, which had culminated in the Intercultural Health Policy, the National Plan for Bilingual Intercultural Education, the regulations of the Forest and Forest Wildlife Act and the regulations of the Languages Act.[179]

91. JS12 noted the limited participation of women in prior consultation processes and the fact that no mechanisms to promote their participation had been developed.[180]

92. JS2 gave a full description of the problems relating to indigenous land titles, including legislation, contracts for the transfer of use of forest land and the classification of land, among others, and drew attention to the problem with Act No. 30230 of 2014, which promoted the redistribution of land for investment.[181] JS18 reported that legal mechanisms to protect lands and territories were being weakened.[182]

93. PSG was concerned about the failure of the government to publish a final version of the database of indigenous communities.[183] STP considered that the database was an important step for the recognition of indigenous peoples.[184]

94. JS18 noted that the Office of the Deputy Minister of Intercultural Relations had identified 55 indigenous or aboriginal peoples. However, persons of African descent had not been included in the database and had not been identified as a people.[185]

95. JS15 and JS2 reported on the threats, attacks and displacements to which peoples in voluntary isolation and initial contact were exposed as a result of illegal activities related to mining, illegal tree felling, drug trafficking and gas and oil extraction, in the absence of an effective State protection plan.[186]

96. STP welcomed the law 29735 which protects the use, preservation and recuperation of all indigenous languages in Peru.[187] JS15 drew attention to the fact that indigenous peoples lacked their own media.[188]

97. The Peruvian Black Women's Development Centre (CEDEMUNEP) observed that the law on quotas did not benefit Afro-Peruvians, who — with some exceptions — were not included in parliamentary lists.[189] CEDEMUNEP also noted that the next national census in 2017 would for the first time include the Afro-Peruvian population.[190] In that connection, JS16 questioned the formulation of the "ethnic self-identification" question in the census.[191]

98. JS16 noted that the recently established Directorate of Policies for the Afro-Peruvian Population in the Ministry of Culture did not have the necessary capacity or budget and that there was no specific budget for the implementation of the Development Plan for the Afro-Peruvian Population. In addition, JS16 pointed out that the State had not introduced any public policies specifically aimed at reducing poverty in Afro-Peruvian communities.[192]

99. JS16 noted with concern that Afro-descendent women were recruited for sexual tourism.[193]

100. JS19 drew attention to the effective abolition of the Act on the National Institute for the Development of the Andean, Amazonian and Afro-Peruvian Peoples, along with its collegiate governing council and multisectoral structure, when the Institute was transferred to the Office of the Deputy Minister of Intercultural Affairs.[194]

Migrants, refugees and asylum seekers and internally displaced persons

101. The Center for Justice and International Law (CEJIL) welcomed the adoption of Supreme Decree N 001-2017-IN that provided temporary residence for mothers or fathers of Peruvian minors, persons with permanent disabilities and victims of acts of violence against women. It also saluted the adoption of Decree N 002-2017-IN that addressed the situation of Venezuelan migrants.[195]

Stateless persons

102. CEJIL welcomed the inclusion of statelessness in the Migration Law; however, the definition of stateless person contained in article 8 was not in coherence with the definition established by the Convention Relating to the Status of Stateless Persons of 1954. It stated that Peru still needed to integrate a statelessness determination procedure for the recognition of the status of stateless person. Finally, CEJIL considered positive that the law provided humanitarian visas that can be given to refugees, stateless persons, persons at great risk, victims of trafficking, among others.[196]

Notes

[1] The stakeholders listed below have contributed information for this summary; the full texts of all original submissions are available at: www.ohchr.org. (One asterisk denotes a national human rights institution with "A" status).

Civil society
Individual submissions:

ADF International	ADF International (Switzerland).
AI	Amnesty International (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland).
CAPAJ	Comision Juridica para el Autodesarrollo de los Pueblos Originarios Andinos (Peru).
CEDEMUNEP	Centro de Desarrollo de la Mujer Negra Peruana (Perú).
CEDET	Centro de Desarrollo Etnico (Perú).

CEJIL	Center for Justice and International Law (United States of America);
CHSSS	Centro de Investigacion Interdisciplinar de Sexualidad, Sida y Sociedad (Peru);
CLCGS	Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd (Switzerland);
CNDDHH	Coordinadora Nacional de Derechos Humanos (Peru);
COMISEDH	Comision de Derechos Humanos (Peru);
CS	Cultural Survival (United States of America);
FLD	Front Line Defenders (Ireland);
HRW	Human Rights Watch (Switzerland);
IHRC-OU	International Human Right Clinic of the University of Oklahoma (United States of America);
Instituto Runa	Instituto Runa de Desarrollo y Estudios sobre Genero (Peru);
Peru-Equidad	Centro de Politicas Publicas y Derechos Humanos (Peru);
Proetica	Proetica (Peru);
PSG	Peru Support Group (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);
RSF-RWB	Reporters Without Borders International (France);
STP CH	Society for Threatened Peoples Switzerland (Switzerland)

Joint submissions:

JS1	**Joint submission 1 submitted by:** L'Association Qosqo Maki, l'Association Pasa la Voz et la Fondation Apprentis d'Auteuil (France);
JS2	**Joint submission 2 submitted by:** ARPI SC: Asociacion Regional de Pueblos Indigenas de la Selva Central; CODEPISAM: Consejo de Desarrollo de los Pueblos Indigenas de la region San Martin; CORPI SL: Coordinadora Regional de los Pueblos Indigenas de San Lorenzo; CORPIAA: Coordinadora Regional de los Pueblos Indigenas de AIDESEP- Atalaya; FENAMAD: Federacion Nativa del rio Madre de Dios y Afluentes; ORAU: Organizacion Regional AIDESEP Ucayali; ORPIAN — P: Organizacion Regional de Pueblos Indigenas de la Amazonia Norte; ORPIO: Organizacion Regional de los Pueblos Indigenas del Oriente; COMARU: Consejo Machiguenga del rio Urubamba; AIDESEP: Asociacion Interetnica de Desarrollo de la Selva Peruana (Peru);
JS3	**Joint submission 3 submitted by:** Campaña Peruana por el Derecho a la Educacion (CPDE); Campaña Latinoamericana por el Derecho a la Educacion (CLADE); Centro de Estudios Sociales y Publicaciones (CESIP); Foro Educativo; Tarea Asociacion de Publicaciones Educativas; Central Peruana de Servicios (CEPESER); Centro de Estudios y Publicaciones; Instituto Bartolome de Las Casas; Fundacion Stromme; Consejo de Educacion Popular de America Latina (CEAAL); Organizacion Mundial para la Educacion Preescolar (OMEP) (Peru);
JS4	**Joint submission 4 submitted by:** Paz y Esperanza; Asociacion Pro Derechos Humanos (Aprodeh); Asociacion de Abogados Invidentes; Autismo Peru; Aynimundo; Centro de Empoderamiento de Personas con Discapacidad (CEMPDIS); Clinica Juridica en Discapacidad de la Pontificia Universidad Catolica del Peru; Centro de Politicas Publicas y Derechos Humanos — Peru Equidad; Comision de Damas Invidentes del Peru (CODIP); Confederacion Nacional de Personas con Discapacidad del Peru (CONFENADIP); Grupo de Iniciativa por la Niñez (GIN); Federacion Nacional de Mujeres con discapacidad del Peru (FENAMUDIP); Instituto de Democracia y Derechos Humanos (IDEHPUCP); Musas Inspiradoras de Cambio, Sociedad y Discapacidad (SODIS); Sociedad Peruana de Sindrome de Down (SPSD); Sense

Internacional Peru (Peru).

JS5 **Joint submission 5 submitted by:** Accion Por los Niños; Asociacion Paz y Esperanza; Capital Humano y Social Alternativo (CHS); Comision de Derechos Humanos de Ica (CODEH-ICA); Centro de Estudios de Problemas Economicos y Sociales d[illegible]aventud (CEPESJU); Fundacion Terre des hommes Lausanne Suiza — Filial Peruana; Grupo de Iniciativa por los Derechos del Niño (GIN); Talleres Proyectados a la Comunidad (TIPACOM); Instituto de Seguridad de Derechos Humanos (ISDH); Instituto de Promoción Educativa para el Desarrollo Social (I.A SEMILLA); Centro de Politicas Publicas y Derechos Humanos (Peru Equidad); Terre des Hommes Suisse; Instituto Promoviendo Desarrollo Social (IPRODES); Save the Children International; Voces Ciudadanas y World Vision Peru (Peru).

JS6 **Joint submission 6 submitted by:** INPPARES; Movimiento Manuela Ramos; Asociación Kallpa; CEPESJU; Red Interquorum (jovenes voluntarios); APROPO; Centro de la Mujer Peruana Flora Tristan; Sociedad Peruana de Adolescencia y Juventud. Otros colectivos: Centro Juvenil Futuro del INPPARES; Colectivo "Vayamos". (Peru).

JS7 **Joint submission 7 submitted by:** Red Distrital de Municipios Escolares de Lima Sur; el Movimiento Nacional de Niños y Adolescentes Trabajadores Organizados del Perú (MNNATSOP); Red Nacional de Niñas, Niños y Adolescentes (REDNNA); Organización de Niños, Niñas y Adolescentes de Huánuco (ONNAS Huánuco); Programa de Microcréditos de Niños Trabajadores (Prominants); y el Movimiento de Adolescentes y Niños Trabajadores Hijos de Obreros Cristianos (MANTHOC). (Peru).

JS8 **Joint submission 8 submitted by:** Grupo de Seguimiento a las Reparaciones por Esterilizaciones Forzadas — GREF. Instituciones: Coordinadora Nacional de Derechos Humanos; Demus — Estudio para la Defensa de los Derechos de la Mujer; Asociacion Ser; Instituto de Defensa Legal; Seccion Peruana de Amnistia Internacional; Codispas; ONAMIAP; Aporvi-dha; Hiperactiva Comunicaciones; DocuPeru. Colectivos: Alfombra Roja; Proyecto Quipu; Raices y Alas; Movimiento Amplio de Mujeres Linea Fundacional (MAM Fundacional); Personas: Hilaria Supa; Alejandra Ballon; Raquel Cuentas; Rocio Silva Santisteban; Adriana Fernández; Margarita Diaz Picasso; Jairo Rivas Belloso. (Peru).

JS9 **Joint submission 9 submitted by:** Comité de America Latina y el Caribe para la Defensa de los Derechos de la Mujer — CLADEM; CLADEM PERU; DEMUS; Estudio para la Defensa de los Derechos de las Mujeres; LIFS; Lesbianas Independientes Feministas Socialistas. (Peru).

JS10 **Joint submission 10 submitted by:** Movimiento Manuela Ramos; del Centro de la Mujer Peruana; Asociación de Comunicadores Sociales Calandria. (Peru).

JS11 **Joint submission 11 submitted by:** Centro de Promoción y Defensa de los Derechos Sexuales y Reproductivos — PROMSEX; Centro IDEAS — Piura; la Comunidad Homosexual Esperanza Region Loreto — CHERL. (Peru).

JS12 **Joint submission 12 submitted by:** Centro de la Mujer Peruana FLORA TRISTAN; DEMUS — Estudios para la defense de los derechos de la mujer; Coordinadora Nacional de Derechos Humanos CNDDHH (Peru).

JS13 **Joint submission 13 submitted by**: Marist Foundation for International Solidarity (FMSI); Edmund Rice International (ERI). (Switzerland).

JS14 **Joint submission 14 submitted by**: CIVICUS: World

Alliance for Citizen Participation (South Africa); APRODEH Asociacion Pro Derechos Humanos. (Peru).

JS15 **Joint submission 15 submitted by:** Servicios en Comunicación Intercultural Servindi; Consejo Harakbut Yine Machiguenga (COHARYIMA); Organización Nacional de Mujeres Indígenas y Amazónicas del Perú (ONAMIAP); Red de Comunicadores Indígenas del Perú (REDCIP). (Peru).

JS16 **Joint submission 16 submitted by:** Asociación Negra de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos (ASONEDH); Red Peruana de Jóvenes Afrodescendientes (Ashanti Perú); Concejo Nacional Afroperuano — CNAFRO; Instituto Internacional de Derecho y Sociedad (IIDS); con el apoyo del GIA.

JS17 **Joint submission 17 submitted by:** ISHR-International Service for Human Rights; Coordinadora Nacional de Derechos Humanos. (Peru).

JS18 **Joint submission 18 submitted by:** GT-PPII-CNDDHH Grupo de Trabajo sobre Pueblos Indígenas de la Coordinadora Nacional de Derechos Humanos (Peru).

JS19 **Joint submission 19 submitted by:** I) El Pacto de Unidad de Organizaciones Nacionales Indígenas (Pacto de Unidad); Confederación Nacional Agraria (CNA); Confederación Campesina del Perú (CCP); Central Única Nacional de Rondas Campesinas del Perú (CUNARC-P); Federación Nacional de Mujeres Campesinas, Artesanas, Indígenas, Nativas y Asalariadas del Perú (FENMUCARINAP); Organización Nacional de Mujeres Indígenas Andinas y Amazónicas del Perú (ONAMIAP); Unión Nacional de Comunidades Aymaras (UNCA); II) Organizaciones de pueblos con casos emblemáticos: Federación de la Nacionalidad Achuar del Perú (FENAP); Comunidad Nativa Tres Islas; Pueblo Kañaris (Comunidad Campesina San Juan de Cañaris); Pueblos Originarios de Cajamarca. III) Instituto Internacional de Derecho y Sociedad (IIDS); con el apoyo del GIA. (Peru).

JS20 **Joint submission 20 submitted by:** RedTraSex, Asociación de Mujeres Meretrices de Argentina (AMMAR, Argentina); Organización Nacional de Activistas por la Emancipación de la Mujer (ONAEM, Bolivia); Fundación Margen de Apoyo y Promoción de la Mujer (Chile); Asociación de Mujeres Buscando Libertad (ASMUBULI, Colombia); Asociación de Trabajadoras Sexuales La Sala (Costa Rica); Movimiento Orquídeas del Mar (El Salvador); Organización Mujeres en Superación (OMES, Guatemala); Red Nacional de trabajadoras Sexuales de Nicaragua; Red Nacional de Trabajadoras Sexuales de Honduras; Mujeres con Dignidad y Derechos (Panamá); Unidas en la Esperanza (UNES, Paraguay); Red Nacional de Trabajadoras Sexuales de Perú y Organización de trabajadoras sexuales (OTRASEX, República Dominicana). (Peru).

National human rights institution

DdPP Defensoría del Pueblo (Peru).

[2] DdPP, contribución al Examen Periódico Universal, Perú 2017, Tercer ciclo, p. 5.
[3] DdPP, contribución al Examen Periódico Universal, Perú 2017, Tercer ciclo, p. 5.
[4] DdPP, contribución al Examen Periódico Universal, Perú 2017, Tercer ciclo, p. 4.
[5] DdPP, contribución al Examen Periódico Universal, Perú 2017, Tercer ciclo, p. 1.
[6] DdPP, contribución al Examen Periódico Universal, Perú 2017, Tercer ciclo, pp. 4-5.
[7] DdPP, contribución al Examen Periódico Universal, Perú 2017, Tercer ciclo, p. 2.
[8] A/HRC/22/15 recommendation 116.1 (Philippines).
[9] DdPP, contribución al Examen Periódico Universal, Perú 2017, Tercer ciclo, pp. 3-4.
[10] DdPP, contribución al Examen Periódico Universal, Perú 2017, Tercer ciclo, p. 4.
[11] A/HRC/22/15 recommendations 116.28 (Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of) and 116.29 (Brazil).
[12] DdPP, contribución al Examen Periódico Universal, Perú 2017, Tercer ciclo, p. 2.

[11] DeFP, contribucion al Examen Periodico Universal, Peru 2017, Tercer ciclo, pp. 2-3. A/HRC/22/15 recommendation 116.93 (Sri Lanka).
[12] DeFP, contribucion al Examen Periodico Universal, Peru 2017, Tercer ciclo, p. 3. A/HRC/22/15 recommendation 116.39 (Singapore).
[13] DeFP, contribucion al Examen Periodico Universal, Peru 2017, Tercer ciclo, p. 3. A/HRC/22/15 recommendations 116.36 (Australia); 116.37 (Greece); 116.38 (Spain); 116.39 (Singapore); 116.51 (United States of America).
[14] DeFP, contribucion al Examen Periodico Universal, Peru 2017, Tercer ciclo, pp. 1-2.
[15] DeFP, contribucion al Examen Periodico Universal, Peru 2017, Tercer ciclo, p. 4.
[16] DeFP, contribucion al Examen Periodico Universal, Peru 2017, Tercer ciclo, p. 5.
[17] The following abbreviations are used in UPR documents:

ICERD	International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination;
ICESCR	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights;
OP-ICESCR	Optional Protocol to ICESCR;
ICCPR	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights;
ICCPR-OP 1	Optional Protocol to ICCPR;
ICCPR-OP 2	Second Optional Protocol to ICCPR, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty;
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women;
OP-CEDAW	Optional Protocol to CEDAW;
CAT	Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment;
OP-CAT	Optional Protocol to CAT;
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child;
OP-CRC-AC	Optional Protocol to CRC on the involvement of children in armed conflict;
OP-CRC-SC	Optional Protocol to CRC on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography;
OP-CRC-IC	Optional Protocol to CRC on a communications procedure;
ICRMW	International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families;
CRPD	Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities;
OP-CRPD	Optional Protocol to CRPD;
ICPPED	International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance.

[18] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/22/15, paras 116.1-116.3; 116.26; 116.62; 117.1-117.2; 117.5; 119.1-119.2.
[19] CNDDHH, p. 1.
[20] AI, pp. 2-7 and PSG, pp. 2-3.
[21] CAPAJ, pp. 1-8.
[22] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/22/15, paras 116.7-116.8; 116.14-116.18; 116.20; 116.22; 116.91; 118.2.
[23] Instituto Runa, pp. 7-8; CIISSS, p. 7; CNDDHH, p 4; JS9, p. 2. See also AI, p. 2 and CIISSS, p. 7.
[24] AI, p. 2; PSG, p. 3; STP, p. 5.
[25] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/22/15, paras 116.27; 116.31-116.32.
[26] CIISSS, p. 1; AI, p. 4.
[27] CIISSS, p. 1.
[28] Instituto Runa, p. 1.
[29] CIISSS, p. 3; JS9, p. 2; JS12, pp. 2-3 See also JS11, p. 2.
[30] Instituto Runa, pp. 3-4. See also, JS12, pp. 2-3.
[31] Instituto Runa, pp. 3-4; JS9, pp. 2-4.
[32] JS9, pp. 3-4.
[33] JS12, pp. 2-3; See also JS16, pp. 7-8.
[34] JS16, pp. 7-8.
[35] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/22/15, para 116.113.
[36] JS2, pp. 11-12.
[37] CS, pp. 4-5.
[38] STP, pp. 5-6. See also JS18, pp. 9-10.
[39] JS4, p. 4.
[40] COMISEDH, p. 1.

[42] JS18, pp. 7-10; COMISEDH, p. 5. See also CS, p. 6.
[43] Proctica, pp. 1-2.
[44] Peru Equidad, pp. 1-4.
[45] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/22/15, paras 116.4-116.6, 116.34-116.35, 116.54-116.55, 116.64-116.67.
[46] CNDDHH, p. 3. See also JS14, pp. 11-12.
[47] JS14, pp. 11-12; IHRC-OU, p. 4 a.
[48] PSG, p. 5; JS14, pp. 11-12. See also AI, p. 4.
[49] JS17, pp. 3-4.
[50] JS14, pp. 11-12.
[51] COMISEDH, p. 4.
[52] STP, p. 4; AI, pp. 2-4.
[53] JS14, pp. 11-12.
[54] CNDDHH, p. 3. See also AI, p. 2.
[55] JS20, pp. 4-6. See also JS13, p. 9.
[56] A/HRC/22/15 recommendation 116.16 (Morocco).
[57] JS11, p. 2.
[58] JS9, p. 5.
[59] CNDDHH, p. 3.
[60] COMISEDH, p. 1. See also AI, p. 2.
[61] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/22/15, paras 116.49, 116.53, 116.56-116.61, 116.63, 117.3.
[62] CIISSS, p. 3; CEDET, p. 3.
[63] JS9, p. 9.
[64] JS12, p. 5.
[65] JS20, p. 8.
[66] Proctica, p. 4.
[67] JS12, p. 5.
[68] JS11, p. 3.
[69] A/HRC/22/15 recommendations 116.10 (Jordan), 116.30 (Romania) and 116.41 (Australia).
[70] JS6, pp. 10-11.
[71] A/HRC/22/15 recommendations 116.72 (Australia), 116.108 (Greece), 116.25 (Tunisia).
[72] JS19, pp. 9-10.
[73] COMISEDH, p. 3. See also PSG, p. 3 and AI, p. 3.
[74] AI, p. 3.
[75] CNDDHH, p. 2.
[76] CNDDHH, p. 2.
[77] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/22/15, paras 116.5, 116.33, 116.41, 116.72-116.74, 117.4.
[78] CNDDHH, p. 4.
[79] JS14, pp. 5-8; AI, p. 3; FLD, pp. 1-4.
[80] A/HRC/22/15 recommendations 116.74 (Netherlands), 116.72 (Australia), 116.113 (Germany), 116.112 (Hungary), 116.113 (Mexico).
[81] JS14, pp. 5-8. See also AI, p. 2; PSG, p. 6.
[82] JS14, pp. 3-4.
[83] JS11, pp. 5-6. Referring to the recommendation 116.72 (Australia).
[84] JS17, p. 2; JS14, pp. 5-8. See also CS, p. 7; IHRC-OU, p. 4.
[85] FDL, p. 3; JS14, pp. 3-8.
[86] AI, pp. 3-5.
[87] RSF-RWB, pp. 1-2.
[88] JS14, pp. 5-8; JS17, pp. 1-2.
[89] RSF-RWB, p. 3.
[90] A/HRC/22/15 recommendations 116.29 (Brazil) and 116.36 (Australia).
[91] CNDDHH, p. 4.
[92] JS10, pp. 1-12.
[93] JS14, pp. 11-12.
[94] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/22/15, paras 116.21, 116.42, 116.48.
[95] A/HRC/22/15 recommendation 116.21 (Thailand).
[96] JS6, pp. 12-13.
[97] A/HRC/22/15 recommendation 116.42 (United States of America).
[98] JS11, p. 9. See also CLCGS, p. 3.
[99] CLCGS, p. 5.
[100] JS12, p. 3.
[101] CLCGS, p. 6.

[96] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/22/15, paras 116.68-116.71, 119.3.
[97] JS19, p. 4.
[98] CIHSS, pp. 4-5.
[99] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/22/15, paras 116.77, 116.112.
[100] JS12, p. 6.
[101] CEDET, p. 3.
[102] Instituto Runa, p. 6.
[103] JS20, pp. 3-11.
[104] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/22/15, paras 116.19, 116.23, 116.78-116.90, 116.109.
[105] A/HRC/22/15 recommendations 116.81(Brazil), 116.82 (Chile), 116.84 (Morocco), 116.87 (Bangladesh), 116.89 (Belarus), and 116.110 (Bolivia, Plurinational Republic of).
[106] JS19, pp. 6-8.
[107] CLCGS, p. 2.
[108] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/22/15, paras 116.92-116.98, 119.6-119.9.
[109] COMISEDH, p. 5.
[110] JS19, pp. 10-11. See also JS15, pp. 4-5; JS18, p. 3.
[111] A/HRC/22/15 recommendations 116.72 (Australia), 116.108 (Greece), 116.23 (Tunisia).
[112] JS19, pp. 10-11.
[113] JS9, p. 7.
[114] Instituto Runa, p. 7.
[115] JS12, p. 8. See also ADF, p. 3.
[116] JS7, p. 1. See also AI, p. 4.
[117] A/HRC/22/15 recommendations 116.95 (Slovenia) y 116.98 (Mexico).
[118] JS6, pp. 8-9; JS7, p. 2. See also ADF, p. 3.
[119] AI, p. 1.
[120] JS11, pp. 7-8.
[121] ADF, pp. 3-4.
[122] CEDET, p. 4.
[123] CEDET, p. 5.
[124] JS16, pp. 12-13.
[125] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/22/15, paras 116.25, 119.99-116.104.
[126] A/HRC/22/15 recommendations 116.23 (Tunisia), 116.25 (Holy See), 116.31 (Slovakia), 116.99 (Cuba), 116.100 (Indonesia), 116.101 (Hungary), 116.102 (Malaysia), 116.103 (Costa Rica), 116.104 (Honduras).
[127] JS3, pp. 2-4. See also CLCGS, p. 3 and JS12, p. 7.
[128] JS3, pp. 4-5; JS6, p. 4.
[129] JS3, p. 6.
[130] JS3, pp. 8-9.
[131] A/HRC/22/15 recommendations 116.31 (Slovakia), 116.99 (Cuba), 116.100 (Indonesia), 116.101 (Hungary), 116.102 (Malaysia), 116.103 (Costa Rica), 116.104 (Honduras).
[132] JS7, p. 5.
[133] JS9, p. 8.
[134] JS9, p. 8; JS11, p. 4; JS6, pp. 2-3; CIHSS, p. 5.
[135] JS1, pp. 3-5.
[136] Instituto Runa, p. 7.
[137] CEDET, p. 5; JS16, pp. 4-5.
[138] CEDET, p. 2.
[139] JS19, p. 12.
[140] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/22/15, paras 116.28-116.31, 116.36-116.40, 116.51-116.52, 116.75-116.76.
[141] CLCGS, p. 4.
[142] A/HRC/22/15 recommendations 116.30 (Romania) and 116.41 (Australia).
[143] JS6, pp. 5-6.
[144] CNDDHH, p. 5.
[145] JS8, pp. 5-6.
[146] A/HRC/22/15 recommendation 116.56 (Belgium).
[147] JS8, p. 1.
[148] JS12, p. 6.
[149] AI, p.1; PSG, p. 6; and STP, p. 3.
[150] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/22/15, paras 116.9-116.13, 116.24, 116.43-116.47, 116.50, 118.1, 119.4.
[151] CLCGS, p. 2.
[152] A/HRC/22/15 recommendations 116.9 (Belarus), 116.12 (Portugal), 116.50 (Liechtenstein).

[160] JS6, pp. 2-3. See also JS7, pp. 5-6; JS13, pp. 1-2; CLCGS, p. 3.
[161] JS13, pp-1-2.
[162] JS13, p. 8.
[163] JS6, p. 1. A/HRC/22/15 recommendations 116.10 (Jordan); 116.11(Liechtenstein); 116.13 (Republic of Moldova).
[164] JS7, p. 4.
[165] JS1, pp. 3-7.
[166] JS13, p. 6.
[167] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/22/15, paras 116.105-116.107.
[168] CNDDHH, p. 1.
[169] HRW, p. 1.
[170] JS4, pp. 7-8.
[171] HRW, pp. 2-3.
[172] JS4, p. 7.
[173] JS4, pp. 4-6.
[174] A/HRC/22/15 recommendations 116.105 (Italy); 116.106 (Indonesia); 116.107 (Malaysia).
[175] JS7, p. 3.
[176] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/22/15, paras 116.108; 116.11[illegible]; 116.[illegible]71.
[177] JS19, p. 5. See also STP, p. 2.
[178] JS2, pp. 5-8. See also JS15, p. 1; CS, pp. 3-4; FLD, p. 2; IHRC-OL, pp. 1-3; AI, p. 3; PSG, p. 4; JS12, p. 4.
[179] JS18, p. 5-7. See also PSG, p. 4.
[180] JS12, p. 9.
[181] JS2, pp. 1-4. See also AI, p. 2; IHRC-OL, p. 2; STP, p. 7.
[182] JS18, pp. 3-4.
[183] PSG, p. 4.
[184] STP, p. 3.
[185] JS18, pp. 1-3. See also IHRC-OL, p. 3; JS19, p. 3.
[186] JS15, pp. 4-5; JS2 (pp. 8-11) See also STP, p. 2.
[187] STP, p. 3. See also JS15, pp. 2-3.
[188] JS15, pp. 2-3.
[189] CEDEMUNEP, pp. 2-3.
[190] CEDEMUNEP, pp. 4-5.
[191] JS16, pp. 7-8.
[192] JS16 (pp. 5-6) refiriendose a las recomendaciones A/HRC/22/15 116.87 (Bangladesh); 116.81 (Brazil); 116.82 (Chile); 116.84 (Morocco); 116.89 (Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of).
[193] JS16, pp. 10-12. In relation to recommendations A/HRC/22/15 116.22 (Nicaragua); 116.27 (Argentina); 116.28 (Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of); 116.29 (Brazil); 116.30 (Romania); 116.51 (United States of America); 116.52 (Belgium); 116.98 (Mexico).
[194] JS19, p. 13.
[195] CEJIL, pp. 3-4.
[196] CEJIL, pp. 2-5.